

**REMARKS**

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on December 27, 2007. Claims 3-7 and 12-15 have been amended without adding new matter. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that independent claim 1, and claims 2 and 3 dependent therefrom, are allowable. The Office Action states (at p. 2) that the prior art fails to teach or suggest “comparing a ‘new face image’ ... to a ‘face image in the restored original image’ of an image to database.” Applicant agrees that the prior art fails to teach or suggest such features, and wishes to add that other reasons for patentability of the claims exist.

Claim 4 is objected to as being an improper multiple dependent claim. Please note that claim 4 has been amended to depend from claim 1 only, and is no longer a multiple dependent claim. Thus, claim 4 is also in condition for allowance, and the objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 5-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turk et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,164,992) (“Turk”) in view of Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0145657) (“Yamamoto”) in further view of Prokoski (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,594) (“Prokoski”). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Although Applicant disagrees with the rejection, independent claims 5-7 and 12-15 have been amended to further distinguish over the references. The claims have been amended to recite features similar to the features of allowable claim 1. Claim 5 now recites “determining whether a face image from the restored original images matches with the new face image stored subsequently by comparing both face images.” Claim 6 recites “comparing said recognizable again image with said additional new images of specific people subsequently stored in said face identification device.” Claim 7 recites “comparing the another new face image subsequently stored with the recognizable again face image.” Claims 8-11 depend from claim 7.

Claim 12 recites “for each face in the set of detected faces in the reconstructed original image, comparing the face with new face image data.” Claim 13 now recites “for each face in the set of recognizable detected faces, comparing it with subsequently stored new face image data.” Claim 14 recites “for each face in the set of detected faces in the reconstructed original image, comparing it with subsequently stored new face image data.” Claim 15 recites “comparing the recognizable again face to the new face image data to determine whether there is a match.”

Applicant submits that the prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above-quoted limitations of claims 5-15. Claims 5-15 are allowable at least for the reasons noted in the Office Action in favor of allowance of claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn and all of the claims allowed. In view of the above, Applicants believe the Application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that it be passed to issue.

Dated: March 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Peter A. Veytsman

Registration No.: 45,920

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorney for Applicant